1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	Plaintiff,
5	v. Case No. 21-20405
6	NOE GARZA, Hon. Matthew F. Leitman
7	Defendant.
8	
9	SENTENCING HEARING
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
11	United States District Judge Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
12	231 West Lafayette Boulevard Detroit, Michigan
13	Monday, March 27, 2023
14	APPEARANCES:
15	For the Plaintiff: JULES M. DEPORRE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
16	600 Church Street
17	Flint, MI 48502 (810) 766-5177
18	For the Defendant, CUADIEC O LONGCODEED II
19	For the Defendant: CHARLES O. LONGSTREET, II LONGSTREET LAW FIRM, PLLC
20	18971 Livernois Detroit, MI 48221
21	(313) 288-0103
22	
23	
24	
25	To obtain a copy of this official transcript, contact: Robert L. Smith, Federal Official Court Reporter (313) 234-2612 • robert_smith@mied.uscourts.gov

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	<u>MATTER</u>	PAGE
3	SENTENCING HEARING	0
4	Objections to the Presentence Report	. 8 . 17
5	Sentence of the Court	.35
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
Detroit, Michigan
 2
      Monday, March 27, 2023
 3
      at about 12:05 p.m.
 4
 5
               (Court, Counsel and Defendant present.)
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise.
 6
 7
               The United States District Court for the Eastern
 8
     District of Michigan is now in session, the Honorable
 9
     Matthew F. Leitman, United States District Judge, presiding.
10
               You may be seated.
11
               The Court calls Case No. 21-20405, United States of
12
     America v. Noe Garza.
13
               Counsel, please state your appearances for the
14
     record.
15
               MR. DePORRE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
16
     Jules DePorre on behalf of the United States.
17
               THE COURT: Good afternoon. Welcome.
18
               MR. LONGSTREET: Good afternoon. Attorney Charles
19
     Oliver Longstreet, II, on behalf of Noe Garza.
20
               THE COURT: Good afternoon. I see, Mr. Garza, you
     are with us as well. Good afternoon to you.
21
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: We are here for sentencing following
24
     Mr. Garza's conviction on three counts at trial.
25
               Mr. Longstreet, let me start with you. Are you and
```

```
Mr. Garza ready to proceed with sentencing?
 1
 2
               MR. LONGSTREET: The defense is prepared to
 3
     proceed.
 4
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, have you and Mr. Garza
 5
     had a sufficient opportunity to review the presentence
 6
     investigation report prepared by the probation department in
 7
     this case?
 8
               MR. LONGSTREET: I have thoroughly gone over the
 9
     presentence investigation report. I filed proper objections.
10
     However, I did not have the opportunity to go over the
11
     presentence investigation report with Mr. Garza.
12
               THE COURT:
                           I lost you there.
13
               MR. LONGSTREET: I was speaking really fast.
14
               THE COURT:
                          Can you slow down?
15
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                I can. I have thoroughly gone
16
     over the presentence investigation report. I have filed all
17
     the proper objections. However, I have not had the
18
     opportunity to thoroughly go over the presentence
19
     investigation report with Mr. Garza.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. Then we probably can't go ahead
21
     today if you haven't had the opportunity to review the report
22
     with Mr. Garza. Do you want to review it with Mr. Garza in
23
     the lockup?
24
               MR. LONGSTREET: If he would like that.
25
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, what are your thoughts?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: I would very much like that.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Now, the other -- Mr. Garza, you don't
 3
     have to accomplish this today. I want to make sure you guys
 4
     have enough opportunity to review it together. Do you want
 5
     to see if you have enough time in the lockup and then let me
     know? Or what do you guys want to do? Or just adjourn this?
 6
 7
               MR. LONGSTREET: I don't have anything to do until
 8
     7:00 p.m.
 9
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, what are your thoughts?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: I think we could review it before
11
     we proceed today.
12
               THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, are you okay with that?
13
               MR. DePORRE: I think so, Your Honor. I didn't
14
     want to pull out my cellphone but if I could just check?
15
               THE COURT:
                          Sure. I promise not to have you
16
     detained for the next 15 seconds.
17
               MR. DePORRE: It's Judge Lawson I'm actually
18
     looking over at and nervous about. That sounds find, I'm
19
     available the rest of the day.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we -- I have reviewed
21
     this presentence report this morning, it's not that long.
22
     Why don't we tentatively plan to come back in an hour. I
23
     should ask the marshals, does that work for you guys?
24
               UNIDENTIFIED MARSHAL: Your Honor, I do know the
25
     two of us have a 2:00 hearing just down the hall. I can
```

```
check and see if maybe after that 2:00 is done we could bring
 2
     him back up.
 3
                          What's the 2:00, do you know?
               THE COURT:
               UNIDENTIFIED MARSHAL: It is a Judge Michelson
 4
 5
     matter, a sentencing on another hearing over there.
 6
                           Okay. Well, let's do this, let's
               THE COURT:
 7
     tentatively plan on coming back at 2:30, and I will ask
 8
     Michelson what's going on, and we will communicate with you
 9
     guys.
            That will give you guys -- by you guys I mean
10
     Mr. Longstreet and Mr. Garza -- about an hour and 15 minutes
11
     to go over things. When we come back you will let me know if
     that was not enough, and if it's not enough we'll adjourn it.
12
13
               I want to make crystal clear nobody is being rushed
14
     into sentencing today, and we will only go ahead if
15
     Mr. Longstreet and Mr. Garza both independently conclude that
     they have had enough time to review the presentence report.
16
17
               (An off-the-record discussion was held at
18
               1:10 p.m.)
19
               THE COURT: Why don't we tentatively plan on 3:00
20
     because Judge Michelson's 2:00 is a change-of-plea hearing,
21
     and we are short on deputy marshals.
22
               MR. LONGSTREET: 3:00 is fine with the defense.
23
               MR. DePORRE: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Does that still work for you,
25
     Mr. DePorre?
```

```
MR. DePORRE: Yes, it does.
 2
                          I'm going to run back, call
               THE COURT:
 3
     Judge Lawson and have you arrested. Other than that, I will
 4
     see you at 3:00.
 5
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise. Court is in recess.
 6
               (At 1:11 p.m. court recessed.)
 7
 8
               (Court reconvened at 3:10 p.m.; Court, Counsel and
 9
               Defendant present.)
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise. Court is in session.
10
11
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
12
               It is about 3:10. We have been on a break just shy
13
     of two hours.
14
               Mr. Longstreet, before we took the break, the idea
15
     was for you and Mr. Garza to have an opportunity to review
16
     the presentence investigation report. Have you guys now had
17
     a sufficient opportunity to do that?
18
               MR. LONGSTREET: I believe we have.
19
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, do you agree?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
21
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, do you want to proceed with
22
     the sentencing today?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: I would like to, yes.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then we will do
25
     that.
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, Mr. Longstreet, you have indicated that you and Mr. Garza had a sufficient opportunity to review the report. I see in the draft of the report that I have that you have raised one objection, and I will take that up in a minute. Other than the one listed in the report, do you have any corrections or objections that you care to make? There should have been more than MR. LONGSTREET: one objection because I objected to everything involving the arrest in Burton at the hotel which included multiple paragraphs. However, there are additional objections. defense respectfully objects to line 13 --THE COURT: Let's -- why don't we just go through one at a time. I can tell you the report that I have indicates that the only objection is to page 8, paragraph 29. But I'm willing to go slow and go through whatever else you want to talk about. Why don't we just go through in chronological order in the report and start with the beginning and you tell me everything that you object to. MR. LONGSTREET: Starting at page 5, line 13, this involves an arrest that was not litigated at the trial. is another incident in which the defense believes that there was --MR. DePORRE: Your Honor, I apologize for interrupting Mr. Longstreet. Mr. Longstreet had filed objections to a preliminary report. The government concurred

```
in a number of those objections. There was a revised report
 2
     that was sent out. I believe that the paragraph 13 that he's
 3
     quoting from is the original preliminary report and not the
 4
     revised report. The revised date of the report --
 5
                          I have a revised date of February 24th,
               THE COURT:
     2023.
 6
 7
               MR. DePORRE: Correct, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Do you have that one, Mr. Longstreet?
 9
               MR. LONGSTREET: I don't have the new copy. I only
     have the first one which I made objections to, but I presume
10
11
     that based on the new report my objections were sustained as
12
     the government agreed and they from removed from the report.
13
               MR. DePORRE: I have an extra copy, if I could pass
14
     it to Mr. Longstreet?
15
               THE COURT: You have an extra copy of the --
16
               MR. DePORRE: Of the revised PSR.
17
               THE COURT:
                         Do you happen to have a copy of the
18
     original one as well?
19
               MR. DePORRE: That would be a lot to ask; no, I
20
     don't.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Longstreet, here's my
22
     understanding, and I'm certainly not in a position to
23
     independently vouch for this, but my understanding is that in
24
     the revised report, which is what I have, listed one
25
     objection. So what I would assume is that that is the only
```

```
outstanding objection that wasn't resolved in your favor.
 2
     But just if you want to be safe, I don't mind going through
 3
     everything that you objected to just to make sure it is not
     in here.
 4
 5
               MR. LONGSTREET: Your Honor, I believe the revised
 6
     copy doesn't have these particular items in there. I'm okay
 7
     with them but there are additional --
 8
               THE COURT: Can you pull the microphone a little
 9
     closer?
10
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Sure.
                                       There are additional
11
     objections that Mr. Garza wishes to make --
12
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
13
               MR. LONGSTREET: --including line 12 as one of the
14
     firearms listed in this was involved in the Burton incident
15
     and should not be in this report.
16
               THE COURT: Okay. Can you give me a paragraph
     number?
17
18
               MR. LONGSTREET: Paragraph 29, page 8.
19
               THE COURT: On page 8 I don't have paragraph 29.
20
     Paragraph 29 in mine refers to "adjustment for obstruction of
21
     justice, none." I don't know what paragraph you are --
22
               MR. LONGSTREET: Can I see your updated report?
23
               THE COURT: Just so our record is clear, the report
24
     that I'm referring to -- what I'm talking about what is in
25
     front of me is Docket No. 54.
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MR. LONGSTREET: Very well. I will be referring to
the new report, which will make it paragraph -- page 7,
         It mentions the Smith & Wesson .38 special, and
that Smith & Wesson .38 special was involved in the Burton
incident. That's not an issue that was litigated in this
case and thus I believe it would be improper also.
defense believes that the firearm was found based on a
violation of the Fourth Amendment he does not have the right
to give the police a proper -- police permission to enter
into a hotel room. I believe the government agreed,
dismissed those charges, and did not move forward with that.
So I believe that particular mention of the Smith & Wesson
.38 special should not be a part of this report.
         THE COURT: Mr. DePorre.
         MR. DePORRE: No objection, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. So how would you have --
you would eliminate the words "and a Smith & Wesson .38
special caliber revolver, model 442, serial number BPM7760"
from the report?
                          That's correct.
         MR. LONGSTREET:
         THE COURT: So I will delete the words starting in
this paragraph 26 starting with "and" and ending in
"BPM7760." So paragraph 26 now reads, "As a firearm (a Ruger
EC9 pistol with an obliterated serial number), was possessed
in connection with another felony offense (drug trafficking),
```

four levels are added." And then there is a cite to USSG \$2K2.1(b)(6)(B). That's how it reads now.

MR. LONGSTREET: The defense again objects. I don't believe -- I believe he was charged with possession with intent to deliver -- excuse me, never mind. We still object to the Ruger being mentioned as we didn't believe that should be counted either, but I believe it is being counted twice in paragraph 25 and 26.

THE COURT: I just want to make sure I understand the objection. You are suggesting here — or the basis of your objection is that the four points in paragraph 25 are effectively duplicative of the four points in 26?

MR. LONGSTREET: That's correct.

THE COURT: Let me think out loud with you and get your reaction. My understanding is that the four points that are assessed in paragraph 25 are for the partially obliterated serial number, and that the four points in paragraph 26 are for the possession in connection with another felony offense, and while paragraph 26 references the obliterated serial number, my understanding is that the assessment of four points in paragraph 26 doesn't turn on the obliteration of the serial number whereas the assessment of the four points in 25 does.

MR. LONGSTREET: Which would go to the possession with intent to deliver Suboxone.

1	THE COURT: Was that a question or statement?
2	MR. LONGSTREET: A question.
3	THE COURT: I'm assuming that the drug trafficking
4	offense in paragraph 26 is the I'm sorry, the reference to
5	another felony offense in paragraph 26 is to the possession
6	with intent to distribute the Suboxone.
7	MR. LONGSTREET: There is no legal objection I can
8	make.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Do you then have any other
10	objection you want to make with respect to 25 or 26?
11	MR. LONGSTREET: No.
12	THE COURT: Just so our record is clear, are you
13	saying that you no longer have a basis to object to the four
14	points assessed in 25 and the four points assessed in 26?
15	MR. LONGSTREET: No legal objection, no.
16	THE COURT: So you are agreeing with me?
17	MR. LONGSTREET: I am.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. What next,
19	Mr. Longstreet?
20	MR. LONGSTREET: Defendant objects to line 91 as he
21	believes he has not been
22	THE COURT: Hold on. Let me catch up. So
23	Paragraph 91 refers to federal benefits.
24	MR. LONGSTREET: That's correct. He believes he
25	has not been previously convicted of three prior drug

```
offenses.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, do you have any --
 3
               MR. DePORRE: If I could just have a moment, Your
     Honor?
 4
 5
               MR. LONGSTREET: There's two listed in the report,
 6
     not three.
 7
               PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, Cody Bellamy on
 8
     behalf of the Probation Department.
 9
               For clarity, paragraph 91 reads under Count 3, "The
10
     defendant, having been convicted of a third or subsequent
     drug distribution offense..." That references he has two
11
12
     prior drug distribution offenses, and this offense being his
13
     third.
14
               THE COURT: And so --
15
               MR. LONGSTREET: You've got two.
16
               THE COURT: -- the two priors would be, if I'm
17
     reading this correctly, is it --
18
               PROBATION OFFICER: The Seventh Circuit Court,
19
     Docket No. 15 --
20
               THE COURT: Which paragraph are you referring to?
               MR. DePORRE: Judge, if I may? Jules DePorre.
21
22
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
23
               MR. DePORRE: Paragraph 39 contains two delivery
24
     convictions; one for delivery, manufacture of Vicodin, and
25
     the other for delivery/manufacture of morphine. They were in
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
one case but for I think the federal benefits -- so under
the sentencing guidelines they would be counted as one
conviction -- or one sentence for calculation of the
quideline range, but for calculation of federal benefits
eligibility I really don't know how those are counted but I
do know those are two separate counts he has been convicted
of, two separate delivery counts.
         THE COURT: Is this something that goes into the
judgment that I check?
         MR. DePORRE: Not that I'm aware of.
         THE CASE MANAGER: You can, but we usually do not.
         THE COURT: I assume whether I check it or not
isn't determinative of this point; is that correct?
         PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. You do have
the ability to order that the defendant now become
permanently ineligible of all federal benefits but that would
be totally left to the discretion of the Court.
         THE COURT: All right. Well, with respect to your
objection, Mr. Longstreet, do you want to add in at the end
of paragraph 91, defendant disputes that he's been convicted
of a third or subsequent drug distribution offense.
         MR. LONGSTREET:
                          Yes.
         THE COURT: Does that satisfy you?
         MR. LONGSTREET:
                          It does.
         THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, does that satisfy you?
```

```
MR. DePORRE: It does, Your Honor.
 1
 2
               THE COURT:
                           I do not intend to include in my
 3
     judgment some sort of disqualifying language permanently
     disqualifying him from federal benefits.
 4
 5
               Mr. Longstreet, what's next?
 6
               MR. LONGSTREET: Mr. Garza objects to paragraph --
 7
     is that all the objections?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 9
               MR. LONGSTREET: Is that all of them?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, do you have any additional
12
     objections?
13
               THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Longstreet, the one
15
     that is in my report that I want to make sure we don't miss
16
     is -- I guess we covered it, but it is paragraph 29 of the
17
     four points for obliterated serial number.
18
               Mr. DePorre, do you have any objections to the
19
     presentence report?
20
               MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, the Probation
22
     Department has calculated the quideline range as 140 to
23
     175 months. I know you are asking for a much lower sentence
24
     than that, but do you agree as a purely technical matter
     given how I have resolved your objections to the guidelines
25
```

```
that that is an accurate calculation?
 1
 2
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Yes.
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, do you concur in that
     calculation?
 4
 5
               MR. DePORRE: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
                          Okay. Then I will adopt the
               THE COURT:
 7
     presentence investigation report as written with the one
 8
     change -- or two changes that I discussed here with
 9
     Mr. Longstreet on the record. I will find that the facts set
10
     forth in the presentence report are true including those that
11
     were used to facilitate the calculation of the quidelines
             I will find that the correct guidelines calculation
12
     range.
13
     is a total offense level 28, criminal history category VI,
14
     for a quideline range of 140 to 175 months.
15
               I have received and reviewed sentencing memos from
16
     both counsel. Thank you very much for those.
17
               What I would propose to do now is to hear first
18
     from Mr. Longstreet, then from Mr. Garza if he wishes to
19
     speak to me, and then from Mr. DePorre.
20
               Mr. Longstreet, do you mind coming to the podium?
21
               MR. LONGSTREET: Sure. Your Honor, we are here
22
     today for a sentencing on possession of -- possession of a
23
     firearm by a felon, possession with intent to deliver
24
     Suboxone, which is a drug used to treat heroin addiction, and
     possession of a firearm with an obliterated serial number.
25
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Although my client was convicted by a jury, we still find rather questionable the facts in the case without diminishing my client's acceptance of responsibility. have three people in a car with a gun underneath the hood of There is no actual possession. The allegation here is constructive possession with no criminality attached. client was not a danger to the public at the time he allegedly possessed this firearm. This firearm was only discovered after it was pulled to the side, trunk open, battery removed, and then they could get to a firearm which tells me that the firearm was not readily accessible to Mr. Garza at the time. Also, even though the jury found him quilty of possession of a firearm, it is still questionable whether that firearm was his or not. There was no evidence that my client's fingerprints were on the firearm. THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, let me jump in here for a second. As I think I mentioned to you previously, I thought you did a wonderful job defending Mr. Garza at trial and a wonderful job trying to spotlight for the jury areas where the jurors should have doubt whether this gun was Mr. Garza's.

But for purposes of sentencing I want to share my personal view. I have absolutely no doubt, zero, that this gun was Mr. Garza's. I'm a hundred percent confident in the jury's verdict. You did a great job trying to create doubt,

nobody could have done more than you, but I'm a hundred percent satisfied this is his gun.

MR. LONGSTREET: Very well. If the Court is satisfied this is his firearm, then I take this position: Even if it was -- even if it is his firearm, it wasn't in the possession that he was going to use it. He was no danger to anybody with it. He didn't try to use it against anybody. He didn't possess it at the time. At this point there is really no showing that he did anything other than -- illegal other than have it underneath the hood of a car where it wasn't accessible. He wasn't a danger to the public at the time. He was in a parking lot and was uninvolved with the crime that got him arrested in the first place.

THE COURT: Uninvolved other than sending the guys in there to steal for him to pay back a drug debt.

MR. LONGSTREET: Well, that's what they said but that's not necessarily what we believe happened. My client took two people to the store to go grocery shopping from what he understood, and they went inside and started stealing. At that point they had all the motive in the world to lie and say we're in here stealing for this guy because one of them was a carjacker and the other one has other issues, both of them were heroin addicts, and they both of them were in there stealing, so they had all the reason in the world to come in here and point the finger to him. So they can come in here

and say, yes, it was his firearm or they could say a lot of different things but I don't think their credibility should go that far, and the Court should not — that the only thing I think the Court should consider at this point is that there was constructive possession of a firearm very far away, not accessible to him, he wasn't a danger to the public at the time, he wasn't doing anything at the time other than sitting in a car, and so to ask somebody to send someone to prison for 10, 15, 14 years for a firearm that is really no danger to anybody at the time he has it we believe is unjust, and because of that we are asking for a five-year sentence.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Longstreet. I appreciated your thoughts.

Mr. Garza, this is your opportunity to speak directly to me. You are not required to say anything, and I certainly won't hold it against you if you don't, but if you would like to say something I would listen carefully. Would you like to speak to me, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. DePorre, your thoughts? Do you mind coming to the podium? And do you mind if I start with a question? You don't have to answer that because I'm just going to do it, so let me start.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Longstreet makes a couple primary points in his sentencing memo, one that he emphasized again today, which was that given the location of the gun relatively speaking the qun didn't pose a threat, that it would take quite an effort by Mr. Garza to get the gun, and that's at least to some extent a mitigating feature of the possession. disagree with that? MR. DePORRE: I don't disagree. I agree that's a mitigating factor. It is not readily accessible. He didn't have it next to him with a round in the chamber ready to use, so I do think that's mitigating. It would take quite some effort to go retrieve that gun. THE COURT: Okay. Next question. This is a bit unusual in that the drug distribution count was for intent -possession with intent to distribute Suboxone, right? MR. DePORRE: Correct. THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet made the point at trial, which seems to me to be a fair one, that's an unusual drug to be distributing in that it is a drug that generally folks are using to get off the really nasty stuff, isn't it? MR. DePORRE: Yes. So Suboxone is primarily used as a -- for opioid use disorder treatment. It can also be used for pain for analgesic effects. I hear a lot about problems we have in THE COURT:

the streets with heroin and meth and crack and that stuff.

```
don't hear a lot about Suboxone. Is it a drug that is --
 2
              MR. DePORRE: It is frequently abused. It doesn't
 3
     have the devastating effects that say fentanyl or meth would
 4
     have, but it is a drug that we see commonly converted from
 5
     its proper use in a prescribed setting to street use, so it
     is similar in that regard to, you know, other opiates like
 6
 7
     OxyContin or Norco.
 8
                          Is it ruining people's lives in the
               THE COURT:
 9
     same way these other opioids are?
10
              MR. DePORRE: Like Norco?
11
              THE COURT: Norco, OxyContin.
12
              MR. DePORRE: No, I think those are worse.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Please go ahead.
14
              MR. DePORRE: Your Honor, the government did submit
15
     a sentencing memorandum in this case. We have asked for a
16
     substantial custodial sentence. We believe that's necessary
17
     in --
18
              THE COURT: What is substantial? Substantial is
19
     kind of in the eye of the beholder. If you and I were asked
20
     about ten different sentences in ten different cases, we
21
     might disagree in every case where the substantial number
22
     lies. Do you have a number in mind?
23
              MR. DePORRE:
                            I don't. I leave it to the Court's
24
                  I think that it needs to be enough to accomplish
     discretion.
25
     the factors that are set forth in the statute. And Congress
```

has given -- Congress has given a fairly comprehensive list of factors for the Court to consider, and many courts come out in different ways on this.

I would note that looking at the sentencing data that offenders that are convicted of the same guideline provision, a crime that references 2K2.1, and are also criminal history category of VI, and base offense level 28, the average sentence in those cases both in terms of mean average and median is 120 months, so that is a very lengthy sentence without question.

And it just -- there is -- based on that -- there aren't a lot of other wild departures from that range when I look at sentencing data, so it does seem like that's where most courts end up.

I would say it is important to also recognize that in most instances, as the Court is aware, criminal defendants plead guilty and they don't go to trial, and they accept responsibility that is something that is unique in this case, and it effects I think the sentence in two ways. Number one, Mr. Garza is not entitled to any credit for acceptance of responsibility.

But I think at a more fundamental level with respect to the factors that the Court has to consider, it is easy when somebody comes before the Court and says I have learned my lesson, I made a mistake, and I promise to do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

better. And it is easy to see a deterrent effect already sort of in progress, that the defendant has acknowledged what they have done as being wrongful, and they have made a commitment to try to change their life and to try to take a different approach in the future. That's something that we don't have in this case, and that's what is perhaps most troubling.

So for that reason I -- primarily for that reason but also because the defendant has engaged in dangerous crimes both with guns and other assaultive crimes that don't involve guns, he's engaged in drug trafficking and other -you know, his drug trafficking is street-level drug trafficking. He's not, you know, the leader of the cartel. He's not high up -- he's not a high-level target for the U.S. Attorney's Office or a figure like that, but the arrest that he was -- that occurred about a week before the Meijer arrest involved a substantial amount of drugs, and not just Suboxone but methamphetamine, heroin. So the defendant is engaged in significant criminal conduct that needs to be detoured, and unfortunately his prior sentences have not detoured him. And the fact that he hasn't accepted responsibility before this Court shows that there's an added basis for a longer, more substantial sentence to effectuate deterrence and to protect the public.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate those

arguments.

I want to make clear that -- and I will talk about my sentence in a minute, and I understand and respect those arguments, but I want to make sure that there is no mistake on this record, I'm not in any way going to penalize Mr. Garza for not accepting responsibility or for going to trial or for persisting in his innocence. I understand your argument, but I want to be clear that under no circumstances is any part of my sentence based on the notion that he exercised his right to have a trial or today he's exercising his right to stay silent. I understand folks get a credit when they accept responsibility but in no way am I going to penalize him today for those two things. Okay.

MR. DePORRE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, I do though have a couple questions that I wanted to ask you.

I told Mr. Garza I wasn't going to penalize him for not saying anything today and I'm not going to. But separate and apart from whatever he might say, can you, as his lawyer, point me to any evidence that there is a reason to believe that Mr. Garza will be on a better path going forward? And here in answering this question you can persist in the position that he was innocent here. Even if he was innocent here, what comfort can I have in moving forward that even if this wasn't a crime in the Meijer parking lot there's some

reason to think that his life going forward will involve gainful, lawful employment, law-abiding behavior, being a constructive member of the community. Is there any evidence of that?

MR. LONGSTREET: I think the best person to answer that is Mr. Garza. Mr. Garza expressed the opinion that he no longer wants to be incarcerated. He's been incarcerated before. He wasn't intending on being incarcerated this time. He was in bad company. He was a part of a -- or he is here basically on a state shoplifting case that got him federal time. I don't think at the time Mr. Garza was trying to get off his heroin. He was using Suboxone to get off that. He was uninvolved in any criminal activity at the time.

So I think the case in and of itself shows my client really didn't have any criminal intent on that particular day. Again, this is a state shoplifting case, a very minor offense that turned major real fast because he's a prior felon. This is a local state case that turned federal which increased the time from two years in the state court to ten years or 15 years in the federal court.

So the question the Court has presented, is there any evidence that my client is going to do any different when there is no evidence that he's not --

THE COURT: Well, again, to make it clear that I'm not insisting that he speak or I'm not penalizing for him not

speaking, sometimes counsel can point me to the fact that while incarcerated somebody took some classes, somebody did some mentoring, something that -- anything that I can point to to get some comfort level that their post-incarceration life will be productive, constructive and law-abiding. That's what I'm trying to get at here. You've answered it but I just want to clarify what I was looking for.

Here is my next question. One of the topics that each of you address in your sentencing memos are the jail calls that were played during the trial. I found those calls quite disturbing in a couple regards, and I want to make sure I give you an opportunity to respond.

The two parts of the calls that concern me the most were the repeated references in here to a willingness to use violence. Mr. Garza repeatedly saying -- I have the transcript -- you know, who he was going to act out violently against.

And then the references to what he asked the girlfriend to do -- or friend in order to get the money to get him out on bound, and he twice directed this woman to generate \$500 for him by performing oral sex on men, and he didn't say it as delicately as I did. His exact words, and I want to say it because it was so impactful on me as I was sitting up here. His exact words were, "Suck a dick. I don't give a fuck." was one. And then the other one was,

```
"Get me the fuck out. Ten dicks, suck them for 50 bucks, or
 2
     fucking five dicks for a hundred bucks, it's $500."
 3
               I don't say that for prurient value, but the
     impression that gave me, Mr. Longstreet, was somebody that
 4
 5
     does not have a lot of value and respect for fellow people.
 6
     And certainly when trying to assess risk to the public and
 7
     law-abiding future and stuff like that, those two sets of
 8
     comments concern me.
 9
               Is there anything that you can say beyond this is
10
     just braggadocio or tough-quy talk or something?
11
               MR. LONGSTREET: I will need permission to release
12
     confidences from my client in order to address that question.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to talk to him or if
14
     you can't answer it now that's fine.
15
               MR. LONGSTREET: I can't answer without breaching
16
     attorney-client privilege.
17
               THE COURT: Do you want to talk to him for a
18
     minute?
19
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                T do.
20
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
21
               (An off-the-record discussion was held at
22
               3:43 p.m.)
23
               MR. LONGSTREET: How I would address that is that
24
     my client was in a desperate situation. However, the
25
     comments about her performing oral sex acts or performing
```

oral sex acts in order to gain money was something he was not serious about.

THE COURT: What about the references to the violence, which were even more concerning?

MR. LONGSTREET: In reference to the violence, that I believe was tough-guy fluff. He was incarcerated. There was some alleged attacks on this young woman's life or threats on this young woman's life. To relieve her from what he believed to be stress from that situation he was trying to ensure that she was safe, that the other rival gang members would not do anything to her, that he was supportive of her or had her back. That nothing would — no danger would come of her. And his whole objective in that conversation was to ensure her that these other gang rival members would not — or try to — attempt to try to comfort her in that these other rival gang members would not bring her harm.

He was not in the position to do anything. He has remained incarcerated since that day so he could not do anything. He knew he could not do anything. And he knew he wasn't going to get out of jail no time soon. With that knowledge, he can talk all — as they say in the neighborhood, you can talk a lot of stuff but you ain't doing nothing. You can talk a whole lot when you are behind the bars. There was nothing he could do, and he knew there was nothing he could do, so the only thing he can do is try to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

make her feel comfortable. Yeah, I'm going to beat these guys up knowing that he couldn't crack a twig. Okay. Thank you. Before I get into THE COURT: the sentencing, Ms. Ryan mentioned I need to rule on the oral motion for acquittal that Mr. Longstreet raised. I'm going to deny the motion. Having sat through the trial I'm confident that when all of the evidence in viewed in the light most favorable to the government there was more than sufficient evidence to support the jury's verdicts here. Okay. Mr. Garza, when I impose sentences in my criminal cases I have to consider and apply the factors set forth in the sentencing statute found at Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a), and I want to walk through with you how I see those factors applying to you and to this case.

Mr. Garza, the first factor I have to consider is the nature and circumstances of the offense, and this is kind of a mixed bag here. Any possession of a firearm by somebody who has been convicted of a felony is a serious matter. Any possession of a firearm in connection with the drug trafficking is a serious matter. So those parts of the offense to me weigh in favor of a more serious sentence.

But I think there are two points that

Mr. Longstreet has pressed that are mitigating factors here.

The nature of this possession, as Mr. Longstreet calls it, constructive possession, where the weapon was located not readily accessible. I think Mr. DePorre candidly acknowledges that is somewhat of a mitigating factor.

Weapons are most dangerous when they are readily accessible with a firearm with a round chambered ready to go and that can be used if the situation heats up, and that wasn't the case with you, and I have given that serious consideration.

The other point that I think is worth highlighting here is the nature of the controlled substance. It's not to be diminished, Suboxone is a controlled substance for a reason, but I think that — this was a point that

Mr. Longstreet made I think effectively at trial that it's a drug that's primary purpose is to get people off of the really bad stuff. And while it is subject to abuse,

Mr. DePorre made that point, he also candidly acknowledged that it is not ripping through the community like Vicodin,

OxyContin, fentanyl and those things, so there is a balance here. It's a serious offense, but there are certainly mitigating factors that I have considered.

The next factor I have to consider is your personal history and characteristics. I read in the presence report that during one of your prior incarcerations -- I think it was in that boot camp you earned your GED, and that's

certainly a credit to you. I read that your future goal is to go to welding school and develop a plan. This is kind of what I was getting at with Mr. Longstreet, and I really hope that you do that.

Mr. Garza, you are still relatively young. I can tell you have a lot of energy, and I think the challenge for you is to focus that energy in a constructive way. So hopefully welding can be your future. And I have certainly and carefully considered that you do have a career goal, and you have been wrestling with your own drug issues over the course of your history, so I have considered that as well.

On the negative side, your criminal history is certainly a concern, and I have factored that into the sentencing decision as well.

But the next factor I have to consider is the sentence needs to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment. Here I do think that a serious sentence is necessary to reflect the overall seriousness of this offense and to promote respect for the law, and to provide a sufficient level of punishment for what happened.

The next factor I have to consider is affording adequate deterrence to criminal conduct. And likewise, here I think a meaningful custodial sentence is necessary. You have had several different stints in custody, none for as

long as I'm going to impose here, but those haven't been long enough to deter from you committing offenses, and that suggests to me that a longer sentence is necessary to achieve specific deterrence.

And likewise here I think a meaningful custodial sentence is necessary to achieve general deterrence to send a message to other folks up in the Flint area that there is a meaning price to be paid for possessing guns and intending to distribute controlled substances.

The next factor I have to consider is protecting the public from further crimes by you. And likewise, I think that this factor requires a meaningful custodial sentence. Again, having listened to these audio tapes and looking at those in connection with your criminal history, I do think that a meaningful sentence is necessary to achieve protection of the public here.

The next factor I have to consider is providing you with needed educational or vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. I am not adding any time to your sentence to achieve that goal but, Mr. Garza, it is my sincere hope that once you get out of whatever county jail you are in now and you get to the BOP that you really take advantage of all of the educational opportunities and skill-building opportunities that they offer.

Your prior terms of custody I think have been exclusively state custody, and from my understanding there is a significant difference between state time and federal time. What I'm referring to here is the opportunity to really develop some skills and improve your knowledge base in the federal system that may not have been available in the state system, and I sincerely hope that you take advantage of that because I think that will help you moving forward to avoid coming back and appearing before somebody like me in another case.

I have to consider the kind of sentences available, and I have done that. I could impose statutorily if I ran everything consecutive, I think it is up to 25 years, but I have also carefully considered the guidelines range of 140 to 175 months.

Finally, I need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among similarly situated defendants. I am going to impose a sentence here that is meaningfully below the guideline range here, but I don't think in doing so I'm going to create a disparity that is unwarranted. I think that the sentence that I impose here is going to be strong enough to send a message but is going to reflect some of the mitigating factors that I mentioned earlier.

So ultimately my task is to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve all

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the goals that I have just mentioned. And while Mr. Longstreet has asked for a sentence of 60 months, and I very much respect his advocacy in asking for that, I think that is not sufficient to achieve the goals of sentencing in this case.

I think that the appropriate sentence and one that in my own mind that I regard as substantial is a sentence of 80 months in custody here. To me that is serious business, it is a long time. You are a young person. It is meant to I know Mr. Garza that's substantially longer than you were hoping to get today, but I want you to understand that is a substantial variance below the bottom of the guidelines. The guidelines are 140 months, and I imposed a sentence that's five years below the bottom of the quidelines. Again, I did that because while I do think this was a serious offense, I think that the mitigating factors here, how it went down, and the lack of immediate threat both how you possessed the gun and the nature of the controlled substances that you had, makes a sentence of 80 months sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing.

So let me formally announce your sentence as follows: Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the Court, considering the sentencing guidelines and the factors contained in Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a),

hereby commits Mr. Garza to the custody of the United States
Bureau of Prisons for a term of 80 months custody on Counts 1
and 3, and 60 months custody on Count 2, all of which are to
run concurrent with one another.

Upon release from imprisonment, Mr. Garza shall be
placed on supervised release for a term of two years on all
counts to run concurrently to each other.

It is further ordered that Mr. Garza pay a special
assessment of \$100 per count for a total of \$300, which is
due immediately.

I will waive the imposition of a fine, the cost of incarceration, and the cost of supervision due to Mr. Garza's lack of financial resources.

Mandatory drug testing is ordered.

Pursuant to Title 34, United States Code,
Section 40702, Mr. Garza shall cooperate with the collection
of a DNA sample as directed by a probation officer.

While on supervision, Mr. Garza shall abide by the standard conditions as adopted by this Court, and with the following special conditions:

Due to the nature of the instant offense and substance abuse concerns, first, Mr. Garza shall submit his person, residence, office, vehicles, papers, business, or place of employment, and any property under his control to a search. Such a search shall be conducted by a United States

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
probation officer at a reasonable time and in a reasonable
manner based upon a reasonable suspicious of contraband or
evidence of a violation of a condition of release. Failure
to submit to such a search may be grounds for revocation.
Mr. Garza shall warn any residents that his premises may be
subject to searches.
         Mr. Garza shall submit to substance abuse testing
to determine if he has used a prohibited substance.
         Mr. Garza shall participate in a substance abuse
treatment program and follow the rules and regulations of
                The probation officer, in consultation with
that programs.
the treatment provider, will supervise Mr. Garza's
participation in the program.
         Mr. Longstreet, do you have any questions
concerning any aspect of the sentence imposed?
         MR. LONGSTREET: I do not.
         THE COURT: Do you have any objections procedural,
substantive or otherwise to any aspect of the sentence
imposed beyond the positions you've already made a part of
the record?
         MR. LONGSTREET:
                          None.
         THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, do you have any questions
concerning any aspect of the sentence?
         MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Do you have any objections?
```

```
1
               MR. DePORRE:
                             None.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Garza, in order to appeal
 3
     your conviction and sentence, you need to file a written
     notice of appeal with the Clerk of This Court within 14 days.
 4
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, can I put on the record
 6
     notice of appeal?
 7
               THE COURT: No, you need to file it in writing, but
 8
     I don't mind asking Mr. Longstreet to file on your behalf.
 9
               Mr. Longstreet, are you willing to do that?
10
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                No.
11
               THE COURT: You are not willing to file the notice
12
     of appeal?
13
               MR. DePORRE: I don't do appeals. I don't do
14
     anything with appeals. I mean, I could file within 14 days,
15
     but I typically don't do the appeals.
16
               THE COURT: All right. Hold on one second.
               (An off-the-record discussion was held at
17
18
               3:58 p.m.)
19
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, how about if you file
20
     it and then move to withdraw in the Sixth Circuit?
21
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                I will do that.
22
               THE COURT: You will do that. Okay.
                                                     Just to be
23
     clear, Mr. Longstreet, when I say 14 days from today, we are
24
     going to get this judgment entered tomorrow, but you can't
25
     file the notice of appeal until we enter the judgment because
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the notice of appeal is from the judgment. So you will see
the judgment pop up on your computer as an e-file, we will
e-file the judgment, and at that point I'm asking you to file
the notice of appeal on Mr. Garza's behalf. Will you do
that, please?
         MR. LONGSTREET:
                          Okay.
         THE COURT:
                     Then will you send Mr. Garza a letter
confirming for him that you have filed the notice of appeal.
         MR. LONGSTREET: I will do that.
         THE COURT: Okay. We have our forfeiture language
in the judgment. I have a few other things to say but let me
make sure we get this in. The judgment will include the
following. Mr. Garza forfeits his interest in the following
property: Pursuant to Title 18, United States Code,
924(d)(1) together with 28 USC 2461(C): First, one black
Ruger EC9s nine-millimeter semi-automatic pistol, serial
number is obliterated; second, one round of nine-millimeter
ammunition; and third, six rounds of nine-millimeter
ammunition.
         The preliminary order of forfeiture which is Docket
No. 58 is hereby incorporated by reference. Any objection to
that, Mr. Longstreet?
         MR. LONGSTREET:
                          No.
         THE COURT: Mr. DePorre?
         MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor.
                                        Thank you.
```

```
THE COURT:
                           Mr. Longstreet, do you want to make any
 2
     request in terms of recommendations that I would make to the
 3
     Bureau of Prisons concerning Mr. Garza confinement?
 4
               MR. LONGSTREET: He's requesting to go to Oxford,
 5
     Minnesota.
                           Mr. Garza, is that a federal prison
 6
               THE COURT:
 7
     there, do you know?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, Wisconsin -- my bad,
 9
     Wisconsin.
10
               THE COURT: Oxford, Wisconsin is what you want me
11
     to recommend?
12
               THE DEFENDANT: Wouldn't I be going to a medium or
13
     low, depends --
14
               THE COURT:
                           I have no idea.
15
               MR. LONGSTREET: The Bureau of Prisons makes that
16
     decision.
17
               THE COURT: But the way it works, Mr. Garza, is I
18
     can make a recommendation to them, they don't have to follow
19
     it, but I can recommend that they house you in a certain
20
     facility. I don't mind doing that if you would like me to do
21
     that.
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Fort Dix or Oxford, Wisconsin.
23
               THE COURT:
                           Where is Fort Dix?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: I don't know where Fort Dix is.
25
               THE COURT: We will figure it out, but you want me
```

```
to put in the judgment that I recommend incarceration either
 2
     at Fort Dix or Oxford, Wisconsin?
 3
               THE DEFENDANT:
               THE COURT: I will do that.
 4
 5
               Holly, anything else on your end?
 6
               THE CASE MANAGER:
                                 Not on my end.
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, let me share a couple last
 8
     thoughts with you. I think you heard me say that when you
 9
     get out of your term of custody you will be on supervised
10
     release. And you've been on parole before, but I want to
11
     stress to you that supervised release here is different. Our
12
     probation officers who supervise folks on supervised release
13
     are really trying to help them. They are trying to help them
14
     connect them with resources to help them succeed in the
15
     community. So when you get out from serving this time, I
16
     hope that you see your probation officer as a teammate and a
17
     supporter who can connect with you the resources you need to
18
     live the life that you want to lead doing welding or whatever
19
     skills you developed in the Bureau of Prisons.
20
               Mr. Garza, do you have any questions or concerns
21
     about anything that happened today that you want to share
22
     with me before we adjourn?
23
               THE DEFENDANT:
                             No.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, Mr. Longstreet?
25
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                No.
```

1	THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, we will look for the
2	notice of appeal shortly after we get the judgment entered.
3	Thank you for that.
4	Mr. DePorre, anything else from the government?
5	MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We are adjourned.
7	THE CASE MANAGER: All rise. Court is in recess.
8	(Proceedings concluded at 4:02 p.m.)
9	
10	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
11	I, Robert L. Smith, Official Court Reporter of the
12	United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United
13	States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcript taken in the matter of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. NOE
14	GARZA, Case No. 21-20405, on Monday, March 27, 2023.
15	s/Robert L. Smith
16	Robert L. Smith, RPR, CSR 5098 Federal Official Court Reporter
17	United States District Court  Eastern District of Michigan
18	Eastern District of Michigan
19	Date: 07/22/2023 Detroit, Michigan
20	beerore, menigan
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	